

Order No. 992701, Delivery No. 383116, Delivery Date:
October 19, 2004 (October 19, Hei 16)

NOTICE OF REASON FOR REJECTION

Application No. : Patent Appln. 2000-065363
Drafting date : October 14, 2004
Examiner : Taizo Hara
Attorneys : Kazuo Shamoto (other 5 members)
Applied Article : Para. 2 of Article 29

The subject application should be rejected for the reason as described below. If the applicant has any opinion against the reason, an argument should be filed within 60 days from the delivery date of this notice.

Reason

The invention claimed in claims as set forth below of this application is recognized to be such as could be easily created on the basis of the inventions described in the following publications distributed in Japan prior to the filing date of this application by any person having common knowledge in the technical field to which such an invention belongs and, therefore, to be ineligible for patent in accordance with the provisions of para. 2 Article 29 of the Patent Law;

Examiner's Remarks:

Reference (1) is cited against claims 1, 2, 3, 5 and 15.

Comparing the invention claimed in claims 1, 2, 3, 5 and 15 with the invention disclosed in Reference (1), there is no substantial difference between them (see the description in the claim, in right bottom paragraph on page 2 and Figs. 1, 3 and 8 of Reference (1)).

References (1) and (2) are cited against claim 4.

Reference (2) discloses a technique of filling a plurality of layers of powder.

References (1) to (3) are cited against claim 6.

It is a commonly practiced matter to use a plurality of feeders (see claim 5 of Reference (3)).

References (1) to (3) are cited against claim 7.

It is a matter that those skilled in the art can adopt at their own discretion to measure weight of the fed powder.

References (1) to (4) are cited against claims 8, 9, 10 and 11.

See reference (4). It is a matter that those skilled in the art can adopt at their own discretion to use a guide rail as a transfer mechanism.

References (1) to (4) are cited against claims 12, 13 and 14.

See Fig. 2 of Reference (4).

References

- (1) Laid-Open Patent Publication No. 49-37807
- (2) Laid-Open Patent Publication No. 2-137696
- (3) Laid-Open Patent Publication No. 3-114699
- (4) Laid-Open Patent Publication No. 11-10397

When amendment of the specification and/or claims is effected, the applicant should ensure that amendment does not constitute addition of new matter. The applicant should consider filing an argument. Further-more, when amendment is effected, the grounds for amendment should be explained.